

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-7, 9-24, 26, 27, 29-32, and 40-43 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, and 27 being the independent claims. Claims 10 and 31 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

MCF5206, Addendum, Watanabe, and Beckert

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16, 17, 20-24, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Motorola MCF5206 Integrated Microprocessor, as described in Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. Product Brief "MCF5206 Integrated Microprocessor" ("MCF5206"), Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. "Addendum to MCF5206 User Manual" ("Addendum"), U.S. Patent No. 5,025,368 to Watanabe ("Watanabe"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,499,078 to Beckert *et al.* ("Beckert"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a plurality of second interrupts that are generated external to said core, said second interrupts having architecturally fixed interrupt priorities[.]" Claim 10 recites, in part, "the first interrupts having architecturally fixed interrupt priorities[.]" Applicant respectfully submits neither MCF5206, Watanabe, or Beckert, whether taken alone, or in combination, disclose at least these features of claims 1 and 10.

Page 7-4 of MCF5206 recites:

Although the interrupt levels of the external interrupts are fixed, customers can program the interrupt priorities of the external interrupts to any value using the IP (IP1, IP0) bits in the corresponding interrupt control registers (ICR7 - ICR1).

(Emphasis added.) Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that MCF5206 does not disclose, teach, or suggest "architecturally fixed interrupt priorities" as recited in claims 1 and 10. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits none of Addendum, Watanabe, or Beckert overcomes the deficiency of MCF5206.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over MCF5206, Addendum, Watanabe, and Beckert. Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 20-24, and 40-43, and 38-42 depend from claims 1 or 10 and are therefore also patentable over MCF5206, Addendum, Watanabe, and Beckert. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16, 17, 20-24, and 40-43, and 38-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Addendum, Watanabe, and Beckert set forth at paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

MCF5206, Addendum, and Watanabe

Paragraph 26 of the Office Action rejected claims 27, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Addendum, and Watanabe. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 27 recites, in part, "receiving the core generated interrupts, the core generated interrupts having programmable priority levels which are intermediate to the architecturally fixed interrupt priorities for the off-core interrupts[.]" As explained above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Applicant respectfully submits that none of MCF5206, Addendum, or

Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests "architecturally fixed interrupt priorities" as recited in claim 27.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claim 27 is patentable over MCF5206, Addendum, and Watanabe. Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 27 and are therefore also patentable over MCF5206, Addendum, and Watanabe. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 27, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Addendum, and Watanabe set forth at paragraph 26 of the Office Action.

MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Agrawal

Paragraph 30 of the Office Action rejected claims 3 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and U.S. Patent No. 5,768,500 to Agrawal *et al.* ("Agrawal"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

As explained above, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1 and 10 are patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, and Beckert, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits Agrawal does not overcome the deficiencies of MCF5206, Watanabe, and Beckert. Claims 3 and 15 depend from claims 1 or 10 and are therefore also patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Agrawal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Agrawal set forth at paragraph 30 of the Office Action.

MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Cutler

Paragraph 33 of the Office Action rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and U.S. Patent No. 5,148,544 to

Cutler *et al.* ("Cutler"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

As explained above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 10 is patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, and Beckert, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits Cutler does not overcome the deficiencies of MCF5206, Watanabe, and Beckert. Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 10 and are therefore also patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Cutler. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Cutler set forth at paragraph 33 of the Office Action.

MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Zimmer

Paragraph 36 of the Office Action rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, U.S. Patent No. 5,940,587 to Zimmer ("Zimmer"). Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

As explained above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, and Beckert, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits Zimmer does not overcome the deficiencies of MCF5206, Watanabe, and Beckert.

Claim 26 depends from claim 10 and is therefore also patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Zimmer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, Beckert, and Zimmer set forth at paragraph 36 of the Office Action.

MCF5206, Watanabe, and Zimmer

Paragraph 39 of the Office Action rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, and Zimmer. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

As explained above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 27 is patentable over MCF5206 and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits Zimmer does not overcome the deficiencies of MCF5206 and Watanabe.

Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 27 and are therefore also patentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, and Zimmer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MCF5206, Watanabe, and Zimmer set forth at paragraph 39 of the Office Action.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicant therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David C. Isaacson', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

David C. Isaacson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,500

Date: August 14, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

851067_3.DOC